

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-24 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. Claims 25-35 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claim 1 is sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-11 and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,173,266 to Marx *et al.* ("Marx"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method that includes:

utilizing at least one generic software component to develop a specific voice application, wherein the utilizing includes invoking at least one generic dialog asset from a repository;

deploying the specific voice application in a deployment environment, wherein the deployment environment includes the repository; and

invoking the at least one generic dialog asset from the repository in the deployment environment.

Based on discussions between the Examiner and Applicants' representatives during an Examiner Interview on October 4, 2005, Applicants believe that claim 1, as presently amended, is patentable over Marx because, among other reasons, Marx fails

to teach or suggest "invoking the at least one generic dialog asset from the repository in the deployment environment," as recited in claim 1.

Since Marx fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1, Marx fails to anticipate claim 1. Marx also fails to anticipate dependent claims 3-11 and 16-24 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3-11 and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marx in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,001 to Uppaluru ("Uppaluru"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Marx does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1, and Applicants assert that Uppaluru does not supply the missing teachings. At a minimum, Marx and Uppaluru fail to teach or suggest "invoking the at least one generic dialog asset from the repository in the deployment environment," as recited in claim 1.

Since Marx and Uppaluru fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, Marx and Uppaluru fail to support a prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claims 2 and 12-15 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 25-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marx in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,785,408 to Britton *et al.* ("Britton"). Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 25-35 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of claims 25-35 moot. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 25-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Nicole D. Dretar  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 54,076

Date: 10-14-2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

453327\_1.DOC